

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
January 5, 2010, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, room 204

Present: Baillargeon, Bennett, Hornsby, King, Moser, Spears, Stewart, Stoskopf
Absent: Charney, Devore, Ganta, Roberts
Proxy: DeRouchey
Visitors: Monty Nielsen

1. Barney King, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm
2. A motion was made by Spears and seconded by Stewart to approve the December 15, 2009 minutes. Motion carried.
3. Graduation list additions – A motion was made by Bennett and seconded by Moser to approve the following additions to graduation lists:

December 2007

Bridget Fleming, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences
Jesse D. Thompson, Associate of Technology, College of Technology and Aviation

August 2009

Natalie Marie Francel-Stone, Bachelor of Music, College of Arts and Sciences

Motion carried

4. Old Business

A. Stand alone minor (see attachments)

Spears moved for approval of the documents that provide for a minor being completed separately from completion of a degree. Hornsby seconded the motion.

Included is a rationale page, which explains the proposal and the reasons behind it. Then there are the changes for the undergraduate catalog, the university handbook, and the approval routing and notification procedures document.

It was briefly discussed how many departments may like to use this approach if it is passed. It isn't seen that this will be a major change within all colleges, but some may choose to take advantage of it. However, the proposal provides that these departments would need to request approval from Faculty Senate Academic Affairs in order to approve a minor for this use. Moser commented he is still opposed to the proposed change on principle for what a minor stands for and he believes that, in most cases, a certificate fills the need. However, he appreciates the process for reviewing proposed changes. Bennett also commented that possibly others may not vote in favor of this change, but it is important that Faculty Senators be given the opportunity to decide. Stoskopf gave his viewpoint from the perspective of a student. It was the consensus that academic affairs should vote to move it forward to senate for discussion. Stewart commented also about the fact that this proposal allows for colleges who *want* to do this, to be able to, but it does not obligate others to participate.

Motion carried (two votes in opposition)

B. HLC Accreditation committee – Academic Affairs representative

More information was requested by committee members. It seems this appointment would be in more of an information sharing role and also the individual would aid in formulating what may go into some documentation for the next visit. This committee will look at *one* of the standards from the HLC and what is needed to support our stand in that one standard. The committee work is very broad based. The writing

is not part of the committees' responsibility. Baillargeon volunteered that she would be willing to be on this committee.

C. Interdisciplinary Undergraduate minors/programs –

Hornsby wished to discuss minors that have no home base or department they are housed in. Entrepreneurship has a minor they want to propose that will be interdisciplinary. What input can Academic Affairs members provide. Spears mentioned again these issues were raised as a concern a couple of years ago and no solution was found at that time. It seems that an advisory board or program approval board, made up of a faculty member from each college would be set up in order to do this. Would it be a conflict of interest for Academic Affairs to be the group that would approve interdisciplinary programs? This was discussed in detail among committee members. This will continue to be an issue which resurfaces unless it is brought forward and resolved. It was highlighted that Academic Affairs may not be the correct place to handle the “college level” role in approving programs, etc. Other issues were also aired during this conversation. Hornsby briefly outlined the core courses that would be involved in the minor and what colleges are involved. It was discussed what type of a filter could be put in place to provide for the “college level” portion. Could it be that the units involved could form a body that would fulfill this role as a temporary solution? Could the required courses be used as a base for what units would be involved? It seems, for long term, when enough of these programs get going, that a separate body, assigned by administration, should be placed as a marker to review these types of programs. Also noted was that even though the FS academic affairs committee is a permanent committee, the members come and go whereas the colleges have more of a mechanism for institutional memory. It seems for now, a short-term solution can be reached in order to allow the Entrepreneurship minor to come through and then further discussion can happen regarding a long term solution. King will also raise this concern with Faculty Senate Leadership Council. Ms. Becker mentioned that during the ad hoc work on the approval, routing, and notification (ARN) procedures manual, these types of programs were discussed and a proposal was made to have a separate position that would oversee these, but because there was, at the time, concern over the type of position and money involved, that portion was removed from the proposal. It was requested that she bring back to academic affairs one of the previous proposed versions of that manual.

5. For the good of the University

6. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Next meeting: January 19, 2010; 3:30 p.m.; Room – Union 204